

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of KRYSTAL SHERILL WILLIAMS,  
DOMINIQUE DENISE WILLIAMS, STARLETTA  
SHERILL WILLIAMS, ALLEN JEROME  
WILLIAMS, DASHAY DENISE CUNNINGHAM,  
ANNDRETTA PATRIECE FIELDS, and DAVID  
JAMES HALSTEAD, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CONSTANCE SHERILL WILLIAMS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CALVIN CUNNINGHAM, WILLIAM PLUMMER,  
DAVID HALSTEAD, DARRYL LEE HARTEN,  
a/k/a DARRYL LEE HARTEN-BEY, PAUL JONES,  
and SAMARIO FIELDS, a/k/a MARIO FIELDS.

Respondents.

---

Before: McDonald, P.J., and Sawyer and White, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the family court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm.

UNPUBLISHED

October 3, 2000

No. 220375

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 91-293076

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989).

Although respondent-appellant testified that she visited her children regularly in 1998, the caseworker testified that respondent-appellant did not do so between November 1997 and the time of trial, which began in December 1998. The trial court resolved this credibility dispute in favor of the caseworker. In this regard, we defer to the trial court's superior ability to weigh and assess the credibility of the witnesses. Hence, we find no clear error in the trial court's decision to terminate respondent-appellant's parental rights under § 19b(3)(a)(ii).

Further, the evidence that respondent-appellant continues to have a problem with cocaine and the absence of any indication that she has corrected that problem, considered in conjunction with evidence that respondent-appellant has continued her transient lifestyle, well supports the trial court's conclusion that the conditions of adjudication continue to exist and are not reasonably likely to be rectified within a reasonable time, § 19b(3)(c)(i), that respondent-appellant failed to provide proper care and custody and is not likely to do so within a reasonable time, § 19b(3)(g), and that the children would likely be harmed if returned to respondent-appellant's care, § 19b(3)(j).

Affirmed.

/s/ Gary R. McDonald  
/s/ David H. Sawyer  
/s/ Helene N. White